



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/665,204	09/18/2000	Nathan F. Raciborski	019396-000200US	4087
7590 Robert P. Marley Motorola, Inc. Broadband Communications Sector 101 Tournament Drive Horsham, PA 19044			EXAMINER SHINGLES, KRISTIE D	
			ART UNIT 2141	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE			MAIL DATE	
3 MONTHS			02/14/2007	
			DELIVERY MODE PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/665,204	RACIBORSKI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kristie Shingles	2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 October 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,6,7,10-14 and 17-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,6,7,10-14 and 17-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

No claims have been amended.

Claims 3, 5, 8, 9, 15 and 16 are cancelled.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 10-14 and 17-20 are pending.

Response to Arguments

I. Applicant's arguments filed 10/4/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

A. *Regarding claims 1, 7 and 14: Applicant argues that the prior art of record, Elledge (US 6,044,399), fails to teach the claimed limitation of "a preference list...wherein the directory (or routing mechanism) is affected by the preference list".*

Examiner respectfully disagrees. *Elledge* teaches the implementation of a facility executed on the client computer, that uses configuration information relating to the client to identify a preferred server for the client's use (*Abstract, col.2 lines 39-67*). The system disclosed in *Elledge* allows for the identity of the preferred server to be stored in order for the client to use the preferred server repeatedly, while also provisioning more than one preferred server for the client and updating the identity of the preferred server in case a more suitable server becomes available (*col.4 lines 1-11, col.7 lines 49-52*). Furthermore, the configuration information includes mapping tables used by the facility, which consists of tables that map from network address ranges to preferred servers and from network drives to preferred servers (*col.3 lines 57-67, col.4 lines 61-67, col.5 lines 1-4, col.5 line 58-col.6 line 65*). It is evident from these

Art Unit: 2141

teachings in *Elledge* that the configuration of the client's system is a determining factor for the facility in deciding which server will be selected as the client's preferred server. The preferred servers and drive mappings do affect the routing of client accesses for desired content, because they are preferenced according to the client's information and based on the server(s) and network drives more suitable for the client—which does achieve the functionality of Applicant's claim language. Applicant's arguments are therefore non-persuasive and the rejection under the prior art is maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

II. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

III. Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13, 14, 17, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Frey, Jr.* (US 6,922,688) in view of *Elledge* (US 6,044,399).

a. **Regarding claim 1, *Frey, Jr.*** teaches a system for distributing content to a client computer, comprising: a server comprising a content object (*Abstract, col.1 lines 28-53*); a first content server at a first address, wherein the first content server comprises a first copy of the content object; a second content server at a second address, wherein the second content server comprises a second copy of the content object (*Abstract, col.3 line 31-col.4 line 65, col.5 lines 4-14*).

Frey, Jr. fails explicitly teach a preference list originating from the client computer, wherein the preference list comprises at least one of the first address and the second address. However, *Elledge* teaches a software facility of the client, which uses the configuration information of the client to a preferred server (*col.2 lines 39-67, col.4 lines 24-33, col.7 lines 45-53*). Furthermore, *Frey, Jr.* and *Elledge* teach a directory located remote to the client computer, wherein the directory maps at least one of the content object, the first copy, and the second copy to the client computer, wherein the directory is affected by the preference list (*Frey, Jr.: col.2 lines 42-51, col.3 lines 45-56, col.5 line 58-col.6 line 43; Elledge: col.2 lines 45-55, col.3 lines 46-48 and 63-67, col.4 lines 54-60*).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Frey, Jr.* with *Elledge* for the purpose of allowing preferential access to the storage device/server bases on the client's priorities, configuration data and load distribution among the servers, wherein a list or data structure maintains the addresses and locations of the storage devices/servers in the system.

b. **Claims 7 and 14** contain limitations that are substantially equivalent to claim 1 and are therefore rejected under the same basis.

c. **Referring to claim 2**, *Frey, Jr.* and *Elledge* teach the system for distributing content to the client computer as recited in claim 1, *Frey, Jr.* further teaches the system further comprising a routing mechanism that maps one of the content object, the first copy and the second copy to the client computer (*col.2 lines 28-61, col.5 lines 15-57; Elledge: col.3 lines 57-67*).

d. **Claim 10** is substantially equivalent to claim 2 and is therefore rejected under the same basis.

e. **Referring to claim 6**, *Frey, Jr.* and *Elledge* teach the system for distributing content to the client computer as recited in claim 1, *Frey, Jr.* further teaches wherein: the content object comprises a first portion and a second portion; the first portion is stored on the first content cache and not on the second content cache; and the second portion is stored on the second content cache and not on the first content cache (*Abstract, col.2 lines 28-51, col.5 lines 15-57; Elledge: col.7 lines 46-52*).

f. **Claims 13 and 19** are substantially equivalent to claim 6 and are therefore rejected under the same basis.

g. **Referring to claim 11**, *Frey, Jr.* and *Elledge* teach the system for distributing content to the client computer as recited in claim 7, *Frey, Jr.* further teaches the system further comprising a server that comprises the content object (*Abstract, col.1 lines 28-53, col.3 line 31-col.4 line 65, col.5 lines 4-14; Elledge: col.3 line 57-col.4 line 11, col.4 lines 51-60*).

h. **Claim 17** is substantially equivalent to claim 11 and is therefore rejected under the same basis.

i. **Referring to claim 20**, *Frey, Jr.* and *Elledge* teach the system for distributing content to the client computer as recited in claim 14, *Frey, Jr.* further teaches, wherein the routing mechanism includes a directory (*col.2 lines 42-51, col.3 lines 45-56, col.5 line 58-col.6 line 43; Elledge: col.2 line 47-50, col.3 lines 45-48, col.6 line 63-col.7 line 9*).

Art Unit: 2141

IV. Claims 4, 12 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Frey, Jr.* (US 6,922,688) in view of *Elledge* (US 6,044,399) and further in view of *Prasad et al* (US 6,539,381).

a. **Regarding claim 4,** *Frey, Jr.* and *Elledge* teach the system for distributing content to the client computer as recited in claim 1, as applied above. While *Frey, Jr.* and *Elledge* fail to explicitly teach wherein the server periodically delivers a catalog of content objects to the directory. *Elledge* does teach mapping tables that map from the contents of the network drive mappings to the preferred servers along with the facility's retrieval of resources of the preferred server, wherein the identity of the preferred server is persistently stored for future access but may also be updated if a more suitable server becomes available (*col.3 line 57-col.4 line 11, col.4 lines 49-60, col.7 lines 46-52*). Nonetheless, *Prasad et al* teach wherein the server periodically delivers a catalog of content objects to the directory (*col.8 lines 6-20*).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the systems of *Frey, Jr.* and *Elledge* with *Prasad et al* wherein the server periodically delivers a catalog of content objects to the directory because the directory must be aware of which caches contain what content, in order to effectively determine which cache will deliver the appropriate content to the client.

b. **Claims 12 and 18** are substantially equivalent to claim 4 and are therefore rejected under the same basis.

Conclusion

V. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: *Smith et al* (US 6,311,216), *Namma et al* (US 6,185,616).

Art Unit: 2141

VI. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

VII. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kristie Shingles whose telephone number is 571-272-3888. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-6:00pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 571-272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2141

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kristie Shingles
Examiner
Art Unit 2141

kds


RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER